

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Henry Golden Reese,)	C/A No. 2:09-1106-TLW-RSC
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
v.)	REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
)	
)	
Warden, Walker State Prison,)	
)	
Respondent.)	
)	

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of this *pro se* petition pursuant to the Rules Governing Section 2254 Proceedings for the United States District Court, the Anti-Terrorism and Effective Death Penalty Act of 1996 (AEDPA), and other habeas corpus statutes. The review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Md. House of Corr.*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995); and *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983).

This Court is required to liberally construe *pro se* documents. *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976). Such *pro se* documents are held to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978), and a federal district court is charged with liberally construing a petition filed by a *pro se* litigant to allow the development of a

potentially meritorious case. *Erickson v Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89 (2007); *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 5, 9 (1980). Even under this less stringent standard, however, this *pro se* petition is subject to summary dismissal. The requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep't of Soc. Serv.*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990).

Background

Petitioner, who is incarcerated in Georgia, files this § 2254 action challenging a 1997 conviction in the Aiken County Court of General Sessions for criminal sexual conduct (CSC). Petitioner states that he received a ten (10) year sentence for the offense and indicates that this sentence has already been served. In any event, Petitioner clearly states that he has not presented the issues raised in the instant habeas petition to the highest state court having jurisdiction.

Discussion

Petitioner's habeas action under 28 U.S.C. § 2254 should be dismissed because Petitioner has not exhausted his state court remedies. With respect to his convictions and sentence, a petitioner's sole federal remedies are a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 and a writ of habeas corpus under 28 U.S.C. § 2254, which can be sought only after the petitioner has exhausted

his state court remedies. See 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b); *Picard v. Connor*, 404 U.S. 270 (1971). The requirement that state remedies must be exhausted before filing a federal habeas corpus action is found in the statute, 28 U.S.C. § 2254(b)(1), which provides that "[a]n application for a writ of habeas corpus on behalf of a person in custody pursuant to the judgment of a State court shall not be granted unless it appears that (A) the applicant has exhausted the remedies available in the courts of the State."

The exhaustion requirement is "grounded in principles of comity; in a federal system, the States should have the first opportunity to address and correct alleged violations of state prisoner's federal rights." *Coleman v. Thompson*, 501 U.S. 722, 731 (1991). The United States Court of Appeals for the Fourth Circuit, in *Matthews v. Evatt*, 105 F.3d 907 (4th Cir. 1997), found that "a federal habeas court may consider only those issues which have been 'fairly presented' to the state courts. . . . To satisfy the exhaustion requirement, a habeas petitioner must fairly present his claim to the state's highest court. The burden of proving that a claim has been exhausted lies with the petitioner." *Id.* at 911 (citations omitted).¹ Because Petitioner clearly states that he

1

Where a habeas petitioner has failed to exhaust his state remedies and the state court would now find his claims procedurally barred, further exhaustion is not required. See *Coleman v. Thompson*, 501 U.S. 722 735 n.1 (1991). However, the federal court is precluded from hearing a procedurally defaulted claim unless the petitioner "can demonstrate cause for the default and actual

has not presented his claims to the state's highest court, the grounds Petitioner could raise in a § 2254 petition have not been exhausted.² See *In Re Exhaustion of State Remedies in Criminal and Post-Conviction Relief Cases*, 471 S.E.2d 454 (S.C. 1990) ("[W]hen the claim has been presented to the Court of Appeals or the Supreme Court, and relief has been denied, the litigant shall be deemed to have exhausted all available state remedies"). See also *State v. McKennedy*, 559 S.E.2d 850 (S.C. 2002). As such, Petitioner's habeas petition is subject to dismissal.

Recommendation


Accordingly, it is recommended that this petition for a writ of habeas corpus be dismissed *without prejudice* and without issuance and service of process upon the Respondent. See *Toney v. Gammon*, 79 F3d. 693, 697 (8th Cir. 1996) (a petition may be summarily dismissed if the record clearly indicates that the

prejudice as a result of the alleged violation of federal law, or demonstrate that failure to consider the claims will result in a fundamental miscarriage of justice." *Id.* at 750.

²

On May 11, 2009, Petitioner submitted a document entitled "Statement of Claim," which requests permission to proceed *in forma pauperis* and contains various civil rights type allegations. (Docket Entry No. 7). While Plaintiff does not indicate the type of relief sought in that pleading, it is noted that Plaintiff may be attempting to seek monetary damages in the "Statement of Claim." However, habeas corpus is not an appropriate or available remedy for damages claims. See *Preiser v. Rodriguez*, 411 U.S. 475, 494 (1973). To the extent Petitioner seeks monetary damages for alleged violations of his constitutional rights, he must file an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

petitioner's claims are either barred from review or are without merit); *Allen v. Perini*, 424 F.2d 134, 141 (6th Cir. 1970) (federal district courts have duty to screen habeas corpus petitions and eliminate burden placed on respondents caused by ordering an unnecessary answer or return). Cf. the AEDPA. Petitioner's attention is directed to the important notice on the following page.


Robert S. Carr
United States Magistrate Judge

June 24, 2009
Charleston, South Carolina

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Court Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. In the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must "only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation." *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005).

Specific written objections must be filed within ten (10) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b). The time calculation of this ten-day period excludes weekends and holidays and provides for an additional three (3) days for filing by mail. Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a) & (e). Filing by mail pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
P. O. Box 835
Charleston, South Carolina 29402

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985).